Holland & Knight LLP 400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: 213.896.2400 Fax: 213.896.2450	1	HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP		
	2	Vito A. Costanzo, SBN 132754 Kristina S. Azlin, SBN 235238		
	3	Stacey H. Wang, SBN 245195 400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor		
	4	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: 213.896.2400		
	5	Fax: 213.896.2450 Email: vito.costanzo@hklaw.com		
	6	kristina.azlin@hklaw.com stacey.wang@hklaw.com		
	7	Attorneys for Defendant		
	8	University of the Pacific		
	9			
	10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	11	FOR THE NORTHERN I	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	12	VINEY SAROYA, Individually and on behalf	Case No.: 5:20-cv-03196-EJD	
	e 13	of all others similarly situated,	[Assigned to the Hon. Edward J. Davila,	
	7. 6. 14	Plaintiff,	United States District Judge]	
	% 15	V.	DEFENDANT UNIVERSITY OF THE	
	: 16	UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC,	PACIFIC'S OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF	
	17	Defendant	SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY	
	18	Defendant.	Hearing Date: November 19, 2020 Time: 9:00 a.m.	
	19		Courtroom: 4	
	20		Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila	
	21		Action Filed: May 10, 2020 Trial Date: TBD	
	22			
	23			
	24			
	25			
	26			
	27			
	28			

CASE NO. 5:20-CV-03196-EJD

OBJECTION TO NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Holland & Knight LLP	400 South Hope Street, 8th Floor	T - 1 - 1 - 1
----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------

Defendant University of the Pacific ("Pacific") hereby objects to Plaintiff's November 5, 2020 Notice of Supplemental Authority (Dkt. 40), which attaches an order from the Southern District of Florida issued October 31, 2020, *Rosado v. Barry Univ., Inc.*, Case No. 20-CV-21813-JEM (S.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2020). As an initial matter, Plaintiff's argument in its notice is improper under Local Rule 7-3(d)(2).

Moreover, not only is the case not binding authority, the decision does not even directly address the issues and arguments raised by Pacific in the current Motion to Dismiss pending before this Court. In particular, *Rosado* does not involve application of California law under *Kashmiri v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*, 156 Cal. App. 4th 809 (2007), nor does it involve a financial agreement specifically governing a student's tuition payment obligations. In view of at least these distinctions, *Rosado* is not relevant. *See, e.g., id.* (addressing that, *inter alia*, a refund policy may have allocated the risk of campus closures, but "[t]hese matters have not been adequately briefed by the parties").

DATED: November 12, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

By /s/ Vito A. Costanzo

Vito A. Costanzo Kristina S. Azlin Stacey H. Wang

Attorneys for Defendant, University of the Pacific